

# CJIS Board Meeting Minutes

December 31, 2007 – 9:00 AM - 10:30 PM

Chief Justice's Office ~ 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Supreme Court

**Attendees:** Gordon Christensen, Tom Trenbeath, Chief Justice VandeWalle, Lisa Feldner, Pam Schafer and Sue Davenport

**Absent:** Nancy Walz, Jerry Kemmet

- Approve minutes from last meeting
  - Tom motioned to approve, Chief Justice seconded, **minutes approved**
- CJIS Staff – CJIS System Support Specialist
  - Tentative offer is out to Darin Anderson from ND Job Service. He has extensive experience with criminal justice background, NIBR's program experience and project management. Start date for the position will be the middle of the month. Looking at reclassifying position.
- CJIS Status
  - LERMS integration, struggling with Motorola, this has delayed the project by a month. Project should be implemented by end of January.
  - History with Motorola
    - Late resolve time, 50% of tickets take over a month to resolve
    - Most calls handled through Motorola's answering service, even during normal business hours
    - Major issue looking for a solutions
    - Lisa will send a letter to Motorola. She has spoken with Captain Dave Kleppe and Justin Data, Project Manager for a State Radio Project, to see if there are there other issues with Motorola.
    - Service contract? Yes we have one with them, we should look closer into that
    - Lisa, do we have a backup option? Yes there are options
    - Pam, support contract is up in March? Can we use that as leverage?
  - Cruiser:
    - Similar issues with Motorola
    - Go live expected in March
  - CJIS/Bismarck PD Integration
    - Progressing smoothly
  - CJIS/NetRMS remaining integration
    - Quotes were higher than expected
    - Integration should be getting less expensive with CJIS Portal 2.0
  - CJIS Portal 2.0
    - ITD lowered their original cost estimate by 50% as Gordon will be doing most of the analyst efforts to realize the cost savings
    - Why so expensive to provide access to additional record types?
      - Custom development
      - Need to make it more of a configuration instead of development
    - It is a good time to do this project

- Questions:
  - Indexing, users want records indexed by all of the categories or just some of those
    - As many as we can match
  - Social security numbers can be sensitive information are we going to have issues with this?
  - What is the difference of development to configuration?
    - At this point, it is done by a programmer through the portal, Gordon is looking to point to a record, more of a configuration to change what form to look at
- Pam, portal 2.0
  - Are we in agreement with that, do we need a vote?
    - This will be the foundation
    - Will be expending funds to get there
    - Agree on methodology?
    - Will save in future costs
    - No vote but this step is supported by board members
    - Other integration project timeline will be delayed as this is the foundation for future integration records.
- MOU
  - One question, executive committee, their role: provides consultation for CJIS board? Should consultation also have recommendation added to that sentence? All here agree to add recommendation to that sentence
  - What did we do with this last time?
    - A few unresolved things such as location and those have been reflected in the current document
  - Nancy Walz's role was discussed; she has always been with CJIS from the start, but is not in the CJIS diagram, if she left, would we replace the position with CJIS?
    - Gordon looked into MTG implementation, long section on governance in there
      - Pam is reporting directly to the board
      - Nancy is head of Enterprise Architect that is perhaps why she should be in the organizational chart to provide services.
    - In the beginning we had no budget at all, they were then also there for money
      - Is Nancy reflected on our budget? No strictly ITD.
        - Lisa thought she may have 10% of her time set up for Enterprise Initiatives, which include CJIS and GIS
    - Does this role need to stay in as part of our permanent structure? The CJIS Board would make all final decisions
      - We may have to reword this role
  - Changes were made on Pam's copy. Pam will send correction out to the CJIS Board
    - Tom moved to approve documents after amendments. Chief Justice seconded.  
**Motion carried.**
- State Radio
  - Gordon is looking at what CJIS provided versus State Radio
    - There are fairly duplicated services that State Radio is already providing
    - Seems to have a strong infrastructure set up as they have upgraded their equipment
    - Good to integrate with?
  - State Radio already handles much of what CJIS does
    - We are putting money into 2 separate entities who could possibly do better together
  - Lisa checked into this as questions resulted from the overlap/duplication of efforts.

- With the meeting with State Radio, Pam is requesting the assistance of an independent consultant from IJIS to make a recommendation. Pam will keep the board informed.
  - There are 2 pending retirements at State Radio who have extensive knowledge on the matter.
- Chief Justice didn't know what State Radio was doing or that they could do these types of things. They have been in various agencies, including OMB.
- Tom thought there had been a disconnect within these two entities of state government
- SAVIN
  - Business Plan
    - Large project oversight is required because of the cost of the project
    - The states jails have been surveyed and they stated they have jail management systems in place and prefer to integrate with SAVIN. The survey spoke for itself. Thus, the statewide jail management system has been removed from the SAVIN business plan.
  - Review Project Charter
    - Similar to our MOU
    - The project charter is the next step in large project oversight process
      - The current project charter a draft
      - Pam wanted to mention the inclusion (limitation) to NDCC 12.1-34.06 referred to under the project scope
        - Entities that are not automated (i.e. smaller counties) may not be included but this does not show a failed project
        - Smaller counties or those entities that are not automated may not be included but this does not show a failed project
      - The board is the first group to see this document as it is a work in progress
      - Project Organization
        - Nancy suggested calling this board, Executive Sponsors, Pam sent out that changed draft in an email and distributed the original draft so the board could review and provide input
      - There was not enough time to make changes in the meeting. The board will look through both documents and send changes or recommendations to Pam
      - After this it will go to the CJIS Executive Steering Committee, then come back to this group
      - Should the current individual listed be signing off on the charter? It was agreed that it would be as the board and DOCR Director has been the start up committee
  - Judiciary Committee – January 8, 2008
    - Pam will be presenting information on the SAVIN project including the timeline of events, costs and status
    - 4 people are testifying for us
    - 2 letters of support also
    - Lisa will attend the Judiciary meeting. Tom is unavailable.

**Adjourned 10:36 am**